

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicants have amended claims 1, 18, 27, 30 and 33. Accordingly, claims 1-37 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-11, 13-16, 30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang (US 5,917,913). The Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 30 and 33 to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang. The Examiner equates the following elements of Wang (From Wang, column 4, lines 12-20 and 40-42) to the present invention (the elements of the present invention being in all caps):

FIG. 2 illustrates...a portable electronic authorization device (PEAD) ("PERSONAL TRUSTED DEVICE") 200, representing the apparatus for securely approving transactions conducted vis-a-vis an electronic transaction system. With reference to FIG. 2, requesting device 202 ("FIRST LOCATION") may initiate a transaction approval process with PEAD 200 ("PERSONAL TRUSTED DEVICE") by transmitting to PEAD 200 ("PERSONAL TRUSTED DEVICE"), via communication port 204 (SERIAL, IR BLUETOOTH, etc.), a transaction request (THIS PRESUMABLY IS EQUATED TO THE HASH OR SELECTED PORTIONS OF THE DOCUMENT TO BE DIGITALLY SIGNED OF THE PRESENT INVENTION) pertaining to a proposed transaction ("DOCUMENT TO BE DIGITALLY SIGNED" OR "RECEIVED DOCUMENT"). Requesting device 202 ("FIRST LOCATION") may represent, for example, an ATM machine, a computer terminal in a network, an automated library check-out terminal, or similar devices for permitting the user to transact business with the electronic transaction system.

The data pertaining to proposed transaction(s) ("DOCUMENT TO BE DIGITALLY SIGNED" OR "RECEIVED DOCUMENT") may then be reviewed by the user, either on a screen 208 of requesting device 202 ("FIRST LOCATION") or optionally on a display

screen provided with PEAD 200 (not shown in FIG. 2) ("PERSONAL TRUSTED DEVICE").

Applicant previously argued that Wang does not teach that the entire document can be displayed at the first location. Examiner disagrees. While Wang does not affirmatively state that the entire document can be displayed at the requesting device (which equates to the "first location" of the present invention), according to the Examiner, nothing in Wang appears to imply or suggest that the entire document cannot be displayed in its entirety at the requesting device ("requesting device" in Wang broadly includes "an ATM machine, a computer terminal in a network, an automated library check-out terminal, or similar devices for permitting the user to transact business with the electronic transaction system"). In order to distinguish the present invention from Wang, Applicants have limited the documents of the present invention to text documents, contracts, letters and sales receipts. In addition, Applicants have further limited the claims by referring to the type of information provided to the personal trusted device (document title, document number/id, author/name id). Finally, the present invention has been limited such that the Personal Trusted Device of the present invention must be located proximate to the First Location (e.g., within IR/Bluetooth range). Support for the foregoing limitations can be found at least at page 6, lines 4-11 and page 7, lines 12-15.

The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-6, 8-11, 13-16 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-11, 13-16, 30 and 33 is respectfully requested.

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schneier ("Applied Cryptography"). As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 1, from which claim 3 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Schneier. Therefore, the allowance of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Mettala, et al. ("Bluetooth Protocol Architecture Version 1.0"). As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 1, from which claim 7 indirectly depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Mettala. Therefore, the allowance of claim 7 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Dierks, et al. ("The TLS Protocol Version 1.0"). As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 1, from which claim 12 indirectly depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Dierks. Therefore, the allowance of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schneier. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 1, from which claim 17 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Schneier. Therefore, the allowance of claim 17 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schneier. The Applicants have amended claim 18 to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Schneier. Specifically, Applicants have limited the documents of the present invention to text documents, contracts, letters and sales receipts. In addition, Applicants have further limited the claims by referring to the type of information provided to the mobile terminal (document title, document number/id, author/name id). Finally, the present invention has been limited such that the mobile terminal of the present invention must be located proximate to the personal computer (e.g., within IR/Bluetooth range). Support for the foregoing limitations can be found at least at page 6, lines 4-11 and page 7, lines 12-15. Therefore, the allowance of claim 18 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schneier. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 18, from which claim 19 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Schneier. Therefore, the allowance of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schneier. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 18, from which claim 20 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Schneier. Therefore, the allowance of claim 20 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schneier. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 18, from which claim 21 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Schneier. Therefore, the allowance of claim 21 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schneier. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 18, from which claim 22 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Schneier. Therefore, the allowance of claim 22 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schneier. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 18, from which claim 23 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Schneier. Therefore, the allowance of claim 23 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schneier. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 18, from which claim 24 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Schneier. Therefore, the allowance of claim 24 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schneier. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 18, from which claim 25 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Schneier. Therefore, the allowance of claim 25 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Schneier. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 18, from which claim 26 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Wang and Schneier. Therefore, the allowance of claim 26 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elgamal (US 5,671,279) in view of Wang. The Applicants have amended 27 claim to include elements not found in Wang and Elgamal. Specifically, Applicants have

limited the documents of the present invention to text documents, contracts, letters and sales receipts. In addition, Applicants have further limited the claims by referring to the type of information provided to the mobile terminal (document title, document number/id, author/name id). Finally, the present invention has been limited such that the mobile terminal of the present invention must be located proximate to the personal computer (e.g., within IR/Bluetooth range). Support for the foregoing limitations can be found at least at page 6, lines 4-11 and page 7, lines 12-15. Therefore, the allowance of claim 27 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elgamal (US 5,671,279) in view of Wang. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 27, from which claim 28 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Elgamal and Wang. Therefore, the allowance of claim 28 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elgamal (US 5,671,279) in view of Wang. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 27, from which claim 29 depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Elgamal and Wang. Therefore, the allowance of claim 29 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elgamal (US 5,671,279) in view of Wang. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 27, from which claim 29 indirectly depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Elgamal and Wang. Therefore, the allowance of claim 31 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elgamal (US 5,671,279) in view of Wang. As noted above, the Applicants have amended claim 27, from which claim 32 indirectly depends to better distinguish the claimed invention from Elgamal and Wang. Therefore, the allowance of claim 32 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants believe all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for claims 1-37.

The Applicants request a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/19/06


Michael Cameron
Registration No. 50,298

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com